

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Gary Ball,

Plaintiff,

v.

Nationwide Credit Corporation; and DOES 1-
10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.: _____

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Gary Ball, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Gary Ball ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Westford, Massachusetts, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. The Defendant, Nationwide Credit Corporation ("Nationwide"), is a Alexandria, Virginia business entity with an address of Nationwide Credit Corporation, 5503 Cherokee Ave

Suite 100, Alexandria, Virginia 22312, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by Nationwide and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. Nationwide at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to a credit card company (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Nationwide for collection, or Nationwide was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Nationwide Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. The Defendants place excessive calls to the Plaintiff – often calling three times a day.

13. During telephone calls, the Defendants are rude and abusive to the Plaintiff.

14. The Defendants have also placed calls to the Plaintiff while he is at work.

15. Despite Plaintiffs requests that Defendants no longer call him at work, such calls continue.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

16. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

17. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

18. The Defendants' conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

19. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

20. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.

21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(3) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at his place of employment, knowing that the Plaintiff's employer prohibited such communications.

22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used profane and abusive language when speaking with the consumer.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

24. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

25. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

26. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

27. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

28. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

29. The Defendant intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff at his place of employment.

30. The telephone calls made by Defendant to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial burden to her existence," thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

31. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

32. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from Defendant.

33. All acts of Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

COUNT III
COMMON LAW FRAUD

34. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

35. The acts, practices and conduct engaged in by the Defendants and complained of herein constitute fraud under the Common Law of the State of Massachusetts.

36. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the foregoing acts and practices, including damages associated with, among other things, humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment caused by the Defendants. All acts of Defendants and the Collectors complained of herein were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendants;

2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to M.G.L. c. 93A § 3(A);
5. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
6. Punitive damages; and

7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: February 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Sergei Lemberg (BBO# 650671)
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (877) 795-3666
Attorneys for Plaintiff